UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/533,103 | 06/05/2006 | Alexander V. Bocharov | 6137NIDDK-2-PUS | 5365 |
| 88195 NIH-O TT | 7590 01/04/20 | 10 | EXAM | IINER |
| 1560 Broadway | 7 | GUDIBANDE, SATYANARAYAN R | | |
| Suite 1200 Denver, CO 802 | 238 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1654 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 01/04/2010 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/533,103 | BOCHAROV ET AL. | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | | SATYANARAYANA R. GUDIBANDE | 1654 | | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply | pears on the cover sheet with | n the correspondence address | | | |
| WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failu Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1.2 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICA | ATION. lly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) | Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | | | |
| 2a)□ | | | | | | |
| 3) | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposit | ion of Claims | | | | | |
| 5) 6) 7) | Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> are subject to restriction and/or | wn from consideration. | | | | |
| Applicat | ion Papers | | | | | |
| 9)□ | The specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | | | |
| 10) | 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority (| under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| a) | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the pr | ts have been received. ts have been received in Apprity documents have been re au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | plication No eceived in this National Stage | | | |
| | e of References Cited (PTO-892) | | mmary (PTO-413) | | | |
| 3) Infor | te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date | | Mail Date ormal Patent Application | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 2, drawn to method that provides treatment for sepsis.

Group II, claim(s) 3, drawn to that provides treatment for inflammation.

Group III, claim(s) 4, drawn to that provides treatment for infection.

Group IV, claim(s) 15, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition for providing treatment for sepsis.

Group V, claim(s) 16, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition for providing treatment for inflammation.

Group VI, claim(s) 17, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition for providing treatment for infection.

Claims 1 and 5-13 link(s) inventions I-III. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claim 1. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or

Application/Control Number: 10/533,103

Art Unit: 1654

nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Page 3

Claims 14 and 18-26 link(s) inventions IV-VI. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claim 14. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Groups I-III lack unity of invention because even though the inventions of these groups require the technical feature of administering a composition comprising a molecule that targets SR-B1, this technical feature is not a special technical feature as it does not make a contribution over the prior art in view of Acton (US 5,998,141). Acton discloses the administering a subject soluble forms of SR-B1 proteins or binding fragments thereof or small molecules

Application/Control Number: 10/533,103 Page 4

Art Unit: 1654

to the subject for interfering in the interaction between SR-B1 and a lipid in treating a disease condition in a patient (column 30, lines 4-14).

Election of Species

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- i) A <u>molecule</u> (a peptide, cholesterol absorption inhibitor, a viral fusion inhibitor, etc.) that targets SR-B1/CLA-1
 - ii) an auxiliary agent or excipient or uptake facilitating agent
 - iii) infection (viral, bacterial, etc.,)

It should be noted that each of the individual species mentioned above for e.g., a peptide, cholesterol absorption inhibitor, a viral fusion inhibitor, etc. is genus by itself.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species that belongs to one individual genus mentioned above with a chemical formula or a structure or with a SEQ ID NO: the corresponds to the single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. If applicants elect a peptide, applicants are required to provide the SEQ ID NO: corresponding to the peptide species, Or if applicants elect an organic molecule, applicants are required to provide the structure of the ,molecule with all the variables (if any present) clearly identified to represent a single compound, etc. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently

Art Unit: 1654

added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowed generic claim. Currently, the following claim(s) are generic: **All claims** are generic.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof. Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1654

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double

Art Unit: 1654

patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satyanarayana R. Gudibande whose telephone number is 571-272-8146. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Satyanarayana R Gudibande/ Examiner, Art Unit 1654

/Andrew D Kosar/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654